

Middlesex University Research Repository

An open access repository of

Middlesex University research

<http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk>

Frost, Nollaig and Bailey-Rodriguez, Deborah ORCID logoORCID:
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9931-563X> (2015) "And it was all my choice but it didn't feel like a choice": a re-examination of interpretation of data using a 'rhetoric of choice' lens. Women's Studies International Forum, 53 . pp. 192-199. ISSN 0277-5395 [Article]
(doi:10.1016/j.wsif.2014.12.003)

Final accepted version (with author's formatting)

This version is available at: <https://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/16907/>

Copyright:

Middlesex University Research Repository makes the University's research available electronically.

Copyright and moral rights to this work are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners unless otherwise stated. The work is supplied on the understanding that any use for commercial gain is strictly forbidden. A copy may be downloaded for personal, non-commercial, research or study without prior permission and without charge.

Works, including theses and research projects, may not be reproduced in any format or medium, or extensive quotations taken from them, or their content changed in any way, without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). They may not be sold or exploited commercially in any format or medium without the prior written permission of the copyright holder(s).

Full bibliographic details must be given when referring to, or quoting from full items including the author's name, the title of the work, publication details where relevant (place, publisher, date), pagination, and for theses or dissertations the awarding institution, the degree type awarded, and the date of the award.

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Middlesex University via the following email address:

eprints@mdx.ac.uk

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated.

See also repository copyright: re-use policy: <http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/policies.html#copy>

Abstract

This research aims to re-examine interpretations of data collected from second-time mothers about their experiences of becoming a mother to a second child using lenses of rhetoric of choice and choice feminism. The interpretations are reconsidered to identify ways in which tensions between maternal status and researcher positionality have influenced the ways they were reached. The paper describes two studies, each conducted by one of the authors, and the interpretations of the data made at the time the research was carried out. It discusses alternative interpretations and how they challenge both the researcher role and theoretical explanations of gender inequity and attachment. The paper concludes that feminist research can be strengthened by attending to the intersections between maternal status, and positioning as feminist, woman and researcher.

Key Words: Researcher positionality, rhetoric of choice, maternal status

The constraints and limitations on choices available to women have long been recognised within feminist research practice (Hesse-Biber, 2013). Rather than stepping into line with assumptions and common sense understandings arising from cultural discourses, feminist research practice aims to challenge taken for granted knowledge that arises from, or perpetuates, oppressive practices towards women in everyday life and their life course. It does this both by illuminating ways in which social structures, and members of the social and political spaces inhabited by women, construct and reinforce knowledge and practices, and by making explicit the assumptions and practices within the research process itself that further (re)construct hierarchies and oppression. Particular care is taken to acknowledge the

influence of cultural and historical discourses in the accounts that women give of themselves and of their relationships with the worlds they inhabit (e.g. Riessman, 1987), and careful attention is paid to flattening the hierarchy between the ‘researcher’ and the ‘researched’ (e.g. Haug, 1987). Additionally, acknowledging differences through awareness of the roles played by secrecy and silence in feminist research processes enables questioning of both the process of giving voice that feminist researchers set out to address and the moments of secrecy and silence that accompany this (Ryan-Flood and Gill, 2011), recognising that the emphasis on ensuring that voices are heard can sometimes overlook the relevance of silences and obscure their meanings for those seeking to survive as women in oppressive cultures. With feminist approaches to researching oppression and the oppressed come ethical, practical, epistemological and methodological concerns that can be addressed more fully by attending to what is left unsaid both by researcher and by participant. Implications of decisions made by researcher or participant to remain silent or to silence the other, must be considered with reference to contexts that span societal oppression and individual choice. Whilst recognising that participants may need to remain silent or secretive about experiences and beliefs, researchers too must consider their own need or decisions whether to speak or not of their own experiences and understandings. Their motivation and method for seeking out knowledge from participants has to be explicit and they must reach careful decisions about what to do with knowledge gained through research. It is the researcher’s responsibility not to represent as commonplace that which is not, and to respect that there may be essential reasons for secrecy and silence. For example, contemplating those who choose to remain silent about their sexuality in restrictive societies in order to avoid victimisation (e.g. Parpart and Thompson, 2011) reminds us that silence can be an important part of identity.

49 Illuminating the researcher role in maintaining or breaking silence and secrecy about
50 themselves or the research they are conducting provides valuable insight to the ways in which
51 researchers encounter the consequence of their decisions. Researcher positionality signifies
52 the ‘perspective shaped by the researcher’s unique mix of race, class, gender, nationality,
53 sexuality and other identities’ (Mullings, 1999: 337). Awareness of downplaying one’s
54 position in order to elicit information and avoid negative criticism (Ahmed, 2010) promotes
55 awareness of the dynamics of gaining and distributing knowledge as a researcher. Deciding
56 whether to, or when to, disclose personal status with regard to the topic under study informs
57 the direction and outcome of the research process and may serve to hinder, help or inhibit the
58 elicitation of data from participants.

59

60 This has been explored specifically in relation to mothers and non-mothers by Frost & Holt
61 (2014). By reflecting on the cultural discourses that place the status of ‘mother’ as central to
62 how women define themselves and other women (e.g. Phoenix et al., 1991), Frost and Holt
63 queried the impact of the questionable moral status attached to the position of (female)
64 childlessness, and of motherhood in our individual research with mothers, one author a
65 mother and the other not (see Frost, 2006 and Holt, 2010). Frost and Holt (2014) sought to
66 open up a dialogue about how ‘maternal status’, as an integral aspect of the status of woman,
67 shaped the research process when exploring a topic which inevitably foregrounded the
68 salience of this status, and explored the tensions which arose when their identities as mothers,
69 researchers, feminists and women conflicted in the pursuit of investigating experiences of
70 motherhood. Frost and Holt (2014) reflected back on their research diaries and analysed their

own and each other's extracts to consider how their maternal status shaped the research topic, their selection of methods and their research practice.

They found that this shaping began with the formation of a research idea, as well as in the practical implications for accessing participants that it involved. They found that they may also have shaped the research method and analytic frameworks they employed because of 'positivist' concerns about 'researcher objectivity', or 'anti-positivist' concerns about 'experiential legitimacy' appearing to be the product of an epistemological anxiety produced by the fear that a researcher's maternal status may damage the credibility of the research. Frost and Holt's (2014) study showed that their maternal status produced particular conflicts for each of them during their research practice so that they experienced tension between wanting to perform both 'good motherhood' and 'good researcher-hood'. They were also challenged to perform 'good feminism' by disclosing maternal status, and to perform 'good feminist research' by hiding that they did not share the world of which our participants spoke. They concluded that their awareness of the ways in which maternal identity and its intersection with identities as researchers, women and feminists, became more or less salient during the research process. It raised questions about whether the conflict between different identities produced limits on what data they were able to elicit and what meanings they could find within it. Frost and Holt (2014) queried whether in some cases, they had actually hindered their (feminist) research goals by staying silent about our maternal status, or by speaking of it.

Women and Choice

The perception and enactment of women's agency over their choices about motherhood is determined by the cultural discourse within which they are constructed and construct

themselves. In Western society, pervasive discourses construct ‘motherhood’ as natural, inevitable and an intrinsic aspect of femininity. In contrast, ‘non-motherhood’ is constructed as unnatural, unwomanly and is characterised by deficiency and loss (Frost & Holt, 2014). In her development of memorywork as a method of investigating women’s experience and formation of identity, in 1987, Frigga Haug and colleagues (Andresen, Bünz-Elfferdin, Hauser, Lang, Laudan, Lüdenabbbm Neur, Nemitz, Neihoff, Prinz, Räthzel, Scheu, and Thomas) recognised that individuals are both part of powerful social structures in society and active participants in them. With the generation and analysis of their own memories, this collective of feminist researchers aimed to understand the parts played by women in constructing their identities, including when this meant they were subordinate to men. Their research explored women’s sexuality as a form of socialization. The experience of subjugation shared by women was viewed as a strength and they sought to examine both reason and emotion in the memories they generated (Haug, 1987). The memorywork method recognised the social and political context of German Marxist philosophy in which the women were living and sought to analyse the conflict between the powerful (male) and the subjugated (female) members of the society by challenging the divide between the objective researcher and the subjective researched. The method worked to gain understanding of how women participated in the construction of, and inserted themselves into, the social structures of their social and political world (see e.g. Frost, Eatough, Shaw, Weille, Baraitser, and Tzemou, 2012 for more details of this method). However now, nearly three decades later, the ‘rhetoric of choice’ allows another way of examining the construction of women in different political worlds.

Feminism and Choice

119 The ‘rhetoric of choice’ works to suggest that women have agency to make private choices
120 but this focus on the individual works to subvert the larger neoliberal ideals and values by
121 diverting the focus from oppressive structures that challenge them (Castaneda and Isgro,
122 2013). McCarver (2011) argues that the closeness of association of the term ‘choice’ with
123 understandings of feminism has led to a dangerous conflation, in which the practice of choice
124 has come to be seen as the practice of feminism, so that “to enact choice means to enact
125 feminism” (McCarver, 2011: 21). This conflation has been encapsulated by Hirshman (2005)
126 in the term ‘choice feminism’ which suggests that as long as a woman has made the choice
127 (about pregnancy, work, family and so on) she is practising feminism. McCarver and others
128 (e.g. Ferguson, 2010) point out the inherent dangers of this in suggesting that feminism now
129 incorporates all choices made by women, regardless of whether they adhere to feminist
130 principles or not. It obscures the role and constraints imposed by social structures by
131 implying that choices are made in isolation by individuals regardless of the impact of social
132 structures. The term ‘choice feminism’ arguably serves to make feminism more palatable to a
133 wider range of women by distancing it from politics and practice seen as “potentially
134 judgemental, exclusionary or radical” (McCarver, 2011: 22).

135 McCarver points out that the dangers of this postfeminist ‘choice feminism’ is that it closes
136 down the need for a feminist agenda in fighting for changes and choices in practices and
137 politics. It draws criticism away from individuals so that all behaviours by women deflect
138 interrogation regardless of the role they play in perpetuating, reinforcing or introducing
139 practices that can render women subservient. She points to the role played by the rhetoric of
140 choice that on the one hand centres choice making within women’s discourses as a means of
141 asserting themselves, and on the other hand implicitly draws on cultural discourses to inhibit
142 or prevent questioning of declarations of choice making by individuals because of the need to
143 show respect for individual autonomy (McCarver, 2011). Castaneda and Isgro (2013)

highlight the power of the ‘rhetoric of sacrifice’ in which sacrifice by mothers is expected and lauded. They reinforce McCarver’s call to address issues of gender inequity concerning family and work by turning the rhetoric of sacrifice on its head to provide alternatives to the rhetoric of choice that prohibits the questioning of women’s choices as long as they have made them themselves (Castaneda and Isgro, 2013; McCarver, 2011).

Feminist researchers play a vital role in challenging and reconstructing the rhetoric of choice in their exploration of the experiences of women. As academics, we seek to explore ways in which our research with mothers may have been inadvertently inhibited by us as feminist researchers seeking to enable marginalised voices to be heard. We do this by revisiting two studies that we have carried out to explore the transition to second-time motherhood, and to use the critique of the ‘rhetoric of choice’ to look again at the interpretations we made at the time of the studies. In particular, we wish to consider whether the interpretations were inherently supportive or victimising of the mothers’ perceptions of the choices they faced with regard to their motherhood of two or more children.

The first study, conducted by Frost, a mother, aimed to explore the transition to second-time motherhood of professional middleclass women in London. The second study, conducted by Rodriguez, not a mother, aimed to explore the transition to second-time motherhood by mothers with a second child who had been born with a perceived disability. The study design and the choice to employ a pluralistic approach to findings and meanings within the data was an important aspect of both studies. Narrative analysis recognizes that people use stories to make sense of their lives and to present themselves and their experiences to others (Sarbin, 1986). It recognises that it is particularly at times of incoherence in events and breaches in the individual’s sense of identity that the stories are useful in making sense of changes in the

sense of self and in the individual's relationship with their surroundings (Bruner, 1987; Emerson and Frosh, 2004; Riessman, 1993). It follows that narrative analysis is well suited to the exploration of identity because it is 'particularly sensitive to subjective meaning-making, social processes and the interpenetration of these in the construction of personal narratives around breaches between individuals and their social contexts' (Emerson and Frosh, 2004: 9).

Our studies employed a pluralistic critical narrative analysis. This enabled us to combine models of narrative analysis to consider the spoken word, the written text, and the micro- and macro-structuring of both in the analysis process. Each model offered a theoretical lens related to a field of research through which narratives can be examined. All of the models adhere to the tenet underlying narrative analysis that one seeks understanding of how individuals make sense of experiences through the study of the stories they tell. The model developed by Labov (1972) allows the identification of 'event narratives' (Squire, 2005) from a structural perspective. Stories are defined as temporally ordered with a 'beginning, middle and end' and are identifiable by the sequence of phrases contained within them. The phrases hold the audience's attention by eliciting and answering a succession of questions.

This model is useful as a starting point in analysis because it provides a means of reducing stretches of text to identifiable narratives. Meanings within the story can then be investigated using different models. Box 1 outlines one form of the model.

Box 1: Labov and Waletzky (1967) Model

Abstract:	<i>What was this about?</i>
Orientation:	<i>Who?, What?, When?, Where?</i>
Complicating Action:	<i>Then what happened?</i>
Evaluation:	<i>So what?</i>
Resolution:	<i>What finally happened?</i>
Coda:	<i>Return to present – end of story</i>

189

190 Gee's 'poetic model' (Gee, 1991) originates in the field of linguistics and provides a set of
191 rules for organizing text by emphasizing the prosodic and paralinguistic aspects of speech.
192 These might include the pitch and intonation with which the stories are narrated. The model
193 pays close attention to the rhythm of the narration and offers a way of systematically
194 deconstructing the narrative into groups of Lines, which in turn define Strophes, Stanzas and
195 Parts of a story. This is useful in identifying changes of topic within stretches of speech and
196 text. It presents the text as stanzas. This in turn enables the analyst to read it differently and to
197 pay attention to different possibilities of meanings (Becker, 1999).

198

199 The authors recognise that knowledge of the interaction within the interview setting provides
200 important information about the narration and highlights both the importance of the context
201 in which they are spoken and the context in which the narrator's knowledge has arisen.
202 Models that take account of the interaction between interviewer and narrator include the
203 critical narrative analysis model (Emerson and Frosh, 2004). This utilizes Gee's poetic model
204 but also actively considers the researcher's role throughout the research process. The
205 'research process' is regarded as inescapably including every aspect of the researcher
206 intervention, from the conduct of the interview to the presentation of the final write-up. The
207 researcher's role was examined at every stage to highlight its influence on the flow and
208 content of the interview through to the meanings it brought to the interpretation. This critical
209 approach sought to counteract the tendency for the researcher to draw on personal and
210 professional discourses to impose pre-given meaning on texts by foregrounding as many
211 assumptions and pre-existing knowledge brought to the research process by the researcher.
212 This was done through careful reflection on the framing of questions asked in the interview,
213 close examination of researcher interjections during the interview, holistic analysis of the

data gathered, and by paying close attention to the ideas and ‘feelings’ of the researcher in the data interpretation. Thus the data analysis considered the researcher role whilst employing different models of narrative analysis to identify and interrogate the content, form and structure of the narratives (Frost, 2009).

We will begin by presenting details of each study and a key finding of each study as made at the time of its conduct. We will then discuss these findings through lenses of ‘choice feminism’ and the ‘rhetoric of choice’. Reflection from each researcher on their motivation and interest in this research topic will be considered throughout.

Study 1: The transition to second-time motherhood carried out by Nollaig Frost

This study investigated the transition to second-time motherhood amongst British, professional women living in London in the early 2000s. It asked ‘What does the narration of women’s daily experiences tell us of their hopes, fears, expectations and realities of becoming a mother to a second child?’ and ‘What do these narratives tell us of the ways in which the women make sense of the perceived changes in their sense of self during and after this transition?’ The study was conducted by Frost shortly after she had become a mother of two children. The study had arisen out of curiosity about personal experience and so, to enhance the trustworthiness and credibility of the study, several steps were taken to ensure this was taken into consideration throughout the research process. In addition to selecting pluralistic critical narrative analysis to gather and analyse the data, the steps taken included the keeping of a reflexive journal, peer consultation with other researchers and supervisory discussions about the process of reaching the Findings.

Seven women in the second trimester of their second pregnancy and in stable relationships with the father of both children were recruited for the study from parenting networks in North

London. Semi-structured interviews were carried out with each woman at three monthly intervals over the course of a year. The aim of the interviews was to enable each woman to talk freely of the experiences and issues of most significance to her as she made the transition to second-time motherhood.

A key finding to emerge, and the focus of this paper, is that all the women spoke of their perceived lack of choice in providing primary care for their children. Primary care giving was practised in ways that included the mothers taking extended maternity leave from their jobs following the birth of the child and providing full-time care in the early months following birth, being the (working) parent who got up in the night to a crying child, taking days off work to stay at home to care for a sick child and employing professional childcare for the older child in order to focus their time and emotions on the new baby. The mothers explained their choices using a range of beliefs that included the lack of ability of men to be gentle, the father earning more than the mother and so needing to be better rested for work, and no one else being able to know the right type and level of care needed for their own children.

One mother, Anna, elegantly described several of these issues in her following words, which are presented after analysis using Gee's model of narrative analysis (1991). This analytical model seeks out linguistic form to gain insight to meaning within narratives:

Stanza 34

*But part of it is I know that Michael Mike's got a job you know he has to
go to the next day
And he's more highly paid than I am
So I sort of think I need to be the one to get up.*

Stanza 35

262 *But equally I'm sort of I don't feel happy with him getting up and changing the nappy*

263 *Because I know that he's not you know*

264 *That as a man he's not that gentle with her*

265 **Stanza 36**

266 *And that it's me*

267 *That I will do it better than him*

268 *That's what I believe anyway*

269 *And so I get up and do it*

270 **Stanza 37**

271 *And that was all my choice*

272 *But it didn't feel like a choice*

273 *Because you know I couldn't*

274 *It just broke my heart anyway*

275

276 *At the time this analysis was presented as:*

277

278 *"Anna describes Mike as being more highly paid than her (Stanza 34) and of not being that*

279 *gentle with the baby (Stanza 35). Anna explains her belief that this is because he is a man*

280 *and that because she will do it better than him she therefore has to be the one to get up to the*

281 *child in the night. Stanza 37 affirms that Anna feels that she has no choice about this. Using*

282 *Gee's model to focus on the text in this way adds a new layer of understanding to Stories 1*

283 *and 2. It provides insight as to why Anna is the parent to get up in the night by informing us*

284 *of her gendered beliefs about childcare and mothering, an insight not available using other*

285 *methods, such as Labov's model (1972) that examines only the structure of narratives.*

286

287 *It has brought texture to the story of getting up in the night and having to be the parent to*
288 *stay at home by telling me that Anna feels that she has no choice but to do this. This*
289 *information was not available in the Labov analysis and enriches the insight gained into one*
290 *way in which Anna makes sense of her experiences as a mother.” (Frost, 2009: 17)*

291

292 Now, using the lenses of ‘choice feminism’ and the ‘rhetoric of choice’ these findings and
293 their explanation can be considered another way. The investigation and portrayal of
294 motherhood in psychology and psychoanalysis is the source of many contemporary everyday
295 discourses about mothers. Notions of the ‘selfish’ mother, the ‘monster’ mother and the
296 ‘greedy’ mother are underlined by an adherence to attachment theory and a focus on the
297 quality of the relationship between mother and child (Alldred, 1999), and questioning about
298 whether they can successfully combine work with family without causing damage or distress
299 to the child. This norm is further perpetuated through the high proportion of research that is
300 carried out with white middle-class nuclear families, such as those featured in this study
301 (Frost, 2011).

302

303 The existence and acceptance of the discourses of the ‘ideal mother’ can inhibit women from
304 speaking freely about their experiences and feelings as mothers. This can lead to a ‘self-
305 policing’ of their thoughts and words as they seek to present themselves to others in ways
306 they think they should be seen (O’Grady, 2005). Whilst presenting herself to me (Frost) as a
307 ‘good mother’ who tended to her children both emotionally and practically, at personal
308 sacrifice of sleep or work, Anna can also be seen to be informing me that she does not have
309 autonomy or freedom over this. Her decision is not an agentic one but is expressed using the
310 rhetoric of choice, and also as one that is the ‘right choice’ – to care for her children. Anna is

demonstrating clearly that she does this, but her distress in narrating it is evident in her words “*It just broke my heart anyway.*” Perhaps the importance of relaying to another professional woman who is also a mother that she is a good mother overrode her desire to inform me that she would choose another path if she felt able to.

The narrative analysis illuminates the frequent use of the word ‘choice’, in line with McCarver’s proposal of a rhetoric of choice that draws attention to it. It serves to constrain others from questioning the choice made, as I did, but Anna’s presentation of it as not being a choice suggests to me now that her perception of choices available to her was one of constraints. Anna further supports her portrayal by calling on the ‘gendered division of labour’ discourse that regards women as better suited to caring for the family than men are – an argument long used to exclude women from the public sphere of society, and thereby from a range of political and civil rights, whilst also justifying their place within the home and as primary caretaker of children (Okin, 1996). As McCarver describes “although choice denotes individual autonomy and freedom, when it comes to raising children the concept of the unselfish motherhood trumps individual needs and wants” (McCarver, 2011: 28).

It is important to reflect on why, as the researcher, I interpreted Anna’s accounts as a free choice at the time of the study. Was I practising choice feminism and taking an easy path of lack of interrogation that resulted in a lack of support for Anna’s plight?

As a relatively new mother of two children myself at the time of the interviews, and as a researcher pursuing doctoral studies, my role as interviewer and data analyst presented complex tensions between competing discourses of the role of ‘successful academic’ and ‘good mother’ (Raddon, 2002). According to Raddon (2002), discourses of the successful

academic expect that all their time is utilised in academia (David et al., 1996; Goode, 2001), in the career oriented, productive pursuit of success (Harris et al., 1998). Dominant discourses of ‘good mothers’ expects them to be selfless and making the most of both worlds (Raddon, 2002). They are expected to put mothering before everything else in order to ensure the best development for their children. Whilst ways of negotiating these tensions in everyday life are complex and varied, they are particularly apposite in the research process when the research is about motherhood and conducted by a mother. As the salience of the maternal status flexes with the research process, the researcher’s positionality enables or limits the exercise of power and informs the social identities within it. Awareness of this enables recognition and responses to the changing balance of power that pervades and impacts on the research process (Lavis, 2010).

As a mother of two children researching new mothers of two children I felt positioned by the participants as an ‘expert’ because I had children who were past the new baby stage that these mothers were just entering. However, I did not feel expert as a new mother of two children. Although, on occasions, I was provoked into wanting to take up a good mother position, as when one participant’s child cried for prolonged periods during our interviews and I worked to resist the urge to attend to the child, I more frequently strove to position myself as the researcher, seeking to put aside my identity as a mother and focusing on eliciting data from the participants. I felt frustration when a child interrupted the interview, or on one occasion when the partner came into the room and remained in the background, to my mind inhibiting what the participant felt able to speak about to me.

Despite this, when listening to the participants, I was often reminded of my own situation as a mother; I agreed with some and disagreed with others of their practices of motherhood.

360 However, as a researcher I sought to remain open and non-judgemental to what was being
361 said to me, to develop and maintain rapport with the participants through an easy
362 conversational style but striving to ensure that the conversation remained about their
363 experiences and not mine. At the same time I aimed to maintain a reflexive stance that
364 considered why I was experiencing the interviews in the way that I was through reflection
365 during and after each interview.

366
367 It seems possible to me now that a possible negotiation of the conflict between wanting to be
368 a good researcher and wanting to be, and appear to be, a good mother, obscured some of the
369 other questions I could have asked of myself and of the data using this approach. Why were
370 the participants choosing to recount their experiences in terms of the unavailability of choice
371 to them? Were the gendered division of labour explanations alongside use of the word choice
372 sufficiently in accord with my own practices that I chose not to question them further with
373 these women? Was the fact that so many of the women I interviewed were so similar to me
374 in age, class, ethnicity and lifestyle that I was somehow wary of questioning their
375 explanations too closely for fear of realising something about myself? Perhaps I had
376 constrained my interpretation of the data precisely because the experiences being described to
377 me were both similar to my own and being told to me by people similar to me.

378
379 We now turn to the second study on second motherhood, conducted by Rodriguez. This study
380 recruits from a similar participant group and considers the data in relation to attachment
381 theory.

382
383 *Study 2: The transition to second-time motherhood by mothers with a second child identified*
384 *as having a disability carried out by Deborah Rodriguez.*

This study explored how mothers of a child without disability experienced the transition to subsequently becoming a mother to a child with a disability, and retrospectively examined what these experiences meant for the mothers' sense of self. In particular, this study investigated how women who have already experienced motherhood to a non-disabled child (re)negotiated their way through second-time motherhood with a disabled child, focusing on how they (re)formulated themselves as mothers. The term 'disability' was self-defined by the mothers, without any limitations placed by the researcher. The children who were identified as having a disability were diagnosed with autism, autism with epilepsy, and Kleeftstra syndrome, and their ages ranged from 5 years to 18 years. five mothers living in Greater London were recruited. One-off semi-structured interviews were carried out with each of the women , which asked the mothers what it what it was like being a mother to one child, what it then meant for them being a mother to a second child with a disability, and their thoughts about their own future. Similarly to Study 1, which used a pluralistic narrative approach by using Gee's (1991) model as well as Labov's (1972) model of narrative analysis, a pluralistic narrative analysis was applied to the data of this study, employing Labov's (1972) model of structural analysis, and a flexible thematic narrative analysis. The flexible thematic narrative analysis drew on both Riessman's (2008) and Riley and Hawe's (2005) respective models.

This study was borne out of my own background, and the wish to understand these personal circumstances further. As the eldest sibling with a younger sister with a disability, I had always felt that attention was mainly paid to my sister because of her disability, and that I, not having a disability, was expected to be self-sufficient and manage with limited attention. I wondered what my reaction might be in discovering whether the mothers felt like they did not have a choice in how they mothered their children with and without a disability (perhaps a sense of relief it could not have been done any other way), or what my reaction might be in

discovering that the mothers felt like they did have a choice (perhaps a sense of dejection because they could have chosen to mother differently).

Similarly to Study 1, a key finding in this study appeared to be that the mothers perceived a lack of choice in providing primary care to their children, particularly towards their children with a disability. In order to care for their child, the mothers did not return to their jobs following the birth of their second child and stayed at home as the primary caregiver. Although they had expected to find paid employment after having their second child, the mothers were not able to do so for many years, until a time when the child with a disability was a teenager. They suggested that the reason for this was due to the amount of attention and care a child with a disability requires, especially during the early years, which meant that they would not have time to work. The mothers also suggested that no one else but them would be able to care for and meet the special needs of their children with a disability.

One of the outcomes of being the sole provider of intense primary care to their child with a disability was that these mothers had to continually prioritise the second child's needs over everyone else's, including other family members' as well as their own. One mother, Jane, describes how everything revolves around her son with a disability, John. Stephen is her first child. Jane's narrative is presented with the application of Labov's (1972) structural model which focuses on how an event is organised and is told in a story context (Riessman, 2008):

Abstract:	Yes so it is about everything is about him
Orientation:	and I don't know, finding out as much as possible about his disability

because it manifests itself in lots of different ways

Complicating

Action:

where he just repeats the same question over
and I tell him the same thing
he will just ask the same question
over and over again.

Evaluation:

I think the main difference is that everything is about him
because it has to be that way,
whereas with Stephen we chose to make everything about
Stephen

Resolution:

but in this case, with John, it just has to be like that.

428

429 In this extract, Jane tells us the significance of informing herself as much as possible about
430 the many ways that John's disability may manifest, and describes an example where John
431 demands attention from her until she provides it. This leads Jane to explain that she has no
432 choice but to focus on John, whereas the amount of attention and focus she gave to Stephen
433 was a choice she made. Jane was able to decide how much of her attention to give her first
434 child without a disability; in contrast, Jane's ability to choose which child to focus on is not
435 available for her to make when she becomes a second-time mother to a child with a disability.
436 It seems as though this is an important point for Jane to stress in the interview, as without
437 prompting, she explained:

438 *“Do you know a lot about autism? Um everything is sort of, it revolves around him but in a*
439 *different way to how I described earlier with Stephen. With Stephen it didn’t have to be that*
440 *way because we just chose to do everything. With John it just has to, that is how it is.”*

441 The above analysis was presented at the time of conducting the study but now can be
442 considered in an alternative manner through the lenses of the ‘rhetoric of choice’ and
443 attachment theory to explain and challenge these initial interpretations on talk about choice.

444 The central notion of attachment theory is the ‘secure base,’ which is the internalisation of a
445 relationship during childhood with an attachment figure characterised by providing consistent
446 support and comfort in times of distress. This may result in the development of a secure
447 attachment style. Close attachment in childhood is necessary for a child to survive and thrive
448 – secure attachments to caregivers provide physical and emotional safety as well as a healthy
449 context for the development of the child. When children are not provided with attentive
450 caring during their early years, their development and capacity to relate to others suffers
451 damage (Bifulco and Thomas, 2013). According to the traditional and ethological view of
452 attachment theory, attachment to the mother is seen as being an innate biological need for
453 infants, and so regular non-maternal care and separation from the mother may have
454 disastrous implications for a child’s development and may disrupt the formation of a secure
455 attachment (e.g.: Clarke-Stewart, 1989; Vaughn et al., 1985; Rodriguez, 2014; Vicedo, 2013).
456 However, a number of concerns about the role of women and mothers have been raised as a
457 result of these conventional beliefs, which encompass several issues relating to this study.
458 The constructed range of cultural gender roles are limited and reinforced, and consequently
459 the construction of motherhood is delineated by the psychological discourses of children’s
460 needs and potential. The traditional view of attachment theory attempts to explain children’s
461 development as an evolutionary and biologically determined phenomenon, reinforcing the

dominant discourse regarding women's reproductive and child-rearing tasks, treating women who choose not to mother as unnatural and not normal (Franzblau, 1999). This is in line with McCarver's (2011) 'Family First' script, which intimates that although women have choices, these choices should be valued and celebrated on the condition that she places her family first. The Family First script offers insight into what is socially recognised and understood as women's roles and responsibilities, and strongly indicates that there is an appropriate choice to be made. However, women who choose otherwise are open to criticism of personal ambition and selfishness (McCarver, 2011), and to notions of the monstrous mother who produces monstrous children (Alldred, 1999). These views are further supported by academic research findings that non-traditional families are perceived as offensive or problematic (Alldred, 1999). Consequently, the 'rhetoric of choice' in line with the Family First script provides an illusion of choice-making within a social actuality of limited choices (McCarver, 2011).

In this study, Jane describes that when she wants to do something other than mother, she has to wait until John is away, such as at an after-school club. In this narrative, Jane is quick to tell me that John likes going to the after-school club, which seems tangential to the point that she is making about her restrictions until he is absent. I wondered why Jane felt the need to add that and for whose benefit she mentioned it for. It may have been that she performing 'good motherhood,' possibly perceiving that I, or others, might judge her mothering choices. I considered my positionality in relation to Jane – I am neither a mother of a child with a disability, nor a mother at all, and so I had no direct tangible experience from which to position myself from with regards to mothering a child with a disability. At this point I had not disclosed to Jane, or to any of the participants, that I had a sibling with a disability as I

considered the possibility that this revelation may have imposed barriers on the stories the mothers chose to recount about choice and the implications this had on their first non-disabled child – they may have felt like they needed to further justify their decisions to me, which I strove to avoid. Perhaps Jane thought that she needed to present her choices and herself as a ‘good mother’ and to defend her perceived lack of choice in this story by telling me that John likes going to the after-school club.

Challenging the traditional view of attachment theory, which positions mothers as the sole source of attachment security and frame for healthy development for the child, is the consideration of multiple attachments. Repeated contact with any caregiving person may result in the formation of an attachment bond, and contemporary research into attachment theory may indicate that not only do children form multiple attachments (Hazan and Shaver, 1994; Howes, 1999), but it is fundamentally adaptive for children to have various attachment figures who fulfil different roles in different contexts (Howes et al., 1988). In her interview, despite being explicitly asked about others that may be involved in providing care to her children, Jane barely mentions her children’s father, and when she does, it is in brief reference to the family moving to another house, to the father working full time, to their marriage unravelling, and finally, to John seeing his father on occasion. During analysis, I wondered what this lack of talk about the father meant with regard to the choices Jane made while mothering her two children. McCarver (2011) describes the absence of additional alternative scripts to the rhetoric of choice as being just as significant and revealing as the choice scripts in women’s discourse, such as the lack of scripts which question the scarcity of feasible and desirable alternative choices for mothers. In Jane’s narrative, there are no comments about the father playing an active role in providing care for his children as a possible alternative choice which would also permit her to do other than mother. Due to the dominant discourses regarding the role of women and mothers such as the traditional and

earlier view of attachment theory, which provided a justification for gendered parental roles by deterministically positioning mothers as being an innate biological need for their infants, Jane may perceive that she has no choice other than to be the sole caregiver to her children, and may not even consider that there may be other choices she can make.

Conclusion

Close re-examination of interpretations that we made of data collected in earlier studies has highlighted the value of considering how the rhetoric of choice can serve to inhibit the feminist researcher role in bringing new insight to the theoretical explanations of gender and attachment as informing mothers' roles. Applying the 'rhetoric of choice' lens to second-time mothers' talk about perceived lack of choice illuminates the dominant discourses about constraints of choice that are imposed by societal expectations behind the 'rhetoric of sacrifice' that expects mothers to prioritise their caring role over their own needs and wishes. The pluralistic narrative analysis approach that we employed to analyse the data provided us with a flexible structure with which both to apply systematic models of data analysis and to explicitly incorporate consideration of our own feelings and positionalities as a mother, a non-mother, women, researchers and feminists to meanings within the data. Careful reflection on our role as researchers assisted in the reconsideration of the meaning in talk about choice.

References

Allred, P. (1999). 'Fit to parent'? Developmental psychology and 'non-traditional' families. In E. Burman, P. Allred, C. Bewley, B. Goldberg, C. Heenan, D. Marks, J. Marshall, K.

534 Taylor, R. Ullah, and S. Warner (Eds.), *Challenging Women: Psychology's Exclusions,*
535 *Feminist Possibilities.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

536 Ahmed, J. U. (2010). Documentary research method: New dimensions. *Indus Journal of*
537 *Management & Social Science, 4,* 1-14.

538 Becker, B. (1999). Narratives of pain in later life and conventions of storytelling. *Journal of*
539 *Aging Studies, 13,* 73-87.

540 Bifulco, A., and Thomas, G. (2013). *Understanding adult attachment in family relationships.*
541 Oxon: Routledge.

542 Bruner, J. (1987). Life as narrative. *Social research, 54,* 11-32.

543 Castaneda, M., and Isgro, K. (2013). *Mothers in Academia.* New York: Columbia University
544 Press.

545 Clarke-Stewart, K. (1989). Day care, malignant or maligned? *American Psychologist, 44,*
546 266-273.

547 David, M., Davies, J., Edwards, R., Reay, D., and Standing, K. (1996). Mothering and
548 education: Reflexivity and feminist methodology. In L. Morley, and V. Walsh (Eds.),
549 *Breaking Boundaries: Women in Higher Education* (pp. 208-223). London: Taylor & Francis.

550 Emerson, P. and Frosh, S. (2004). *Critical Narrative Analysis in Psychology.* Basingstoke:
551 Palgrave Macmillan.

552 Ferguson, M. L. (2010). Choice feminism and the fear of politics. *Perspectives on Politics, 8,*
553 247-253.

554 Franzblau, S. H. (1999). Historicizing attachment theory: Binding the ties that bind.
555 *Feminism and Psychology, 9,* 22-31.

- 556 Frost, N. (2006). *Taking the other out of mother: The transition to second-time motherhood*.
 557 (Unpublished doctoral thesis) Birkbeck University, London.
- 558 Frost, N. (2009). 'Do you know what I mean?': The use of a pluralistic narrative analysis
 559 approach in the interpretation of an interview. *Qualitative Research*, 9, 9-29.
- 560 Frost, N. (2011). Mothering on the Margins of Space: Meanings of 'space' in accounts of
 561 maternal experience, *Radical Psychology*, 9(2).
- 562 Frost, N., Eatough, V. E., Shaw, R., Weille, K-L., Baraitser, L., and Tzemou, E. (2012).
 563 Memory-work: Early Encounters. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 9, 399-419.
- 564 Frost, N., and Holt, A. (2014). Mother, researcher, feminist, woman: Reflections on 'maternal
 565 status' as a researcher identity. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 14, 90-102.
- 566 Gee, J. P. (1991). A linguistic approach to narrative. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 1,
 567 15-39.
- 568 Goode, J. (2001). Is the position of women in higher education changing? *International*
 569 *Perspectives on Higher Education Research*, 1, 243-284.
- 570 Harris, P., Thiele, B., and Currie, J. (1998). Success, gender and academic voices. Consuming
 571 passion or selling the soul? *Gender and Education*, 10, 133-148.
- 572 Haug, F. (Ed.) (1987). *Female sexualisation: a collective work of memory* (transl. E. Carter).
 573 London and New York: Verso.
- 574 Hazan, C., and Shaver, P. R. (1994). Deeper into attachment theory. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5,
 575 68-79.
- 576 Hesse-Biber, S. (2013). *Feminist research practice: A primer*. London: Sage Publications.
- 577 Hirshman, L. (2005). America's stay-at-home feminists. *American Prospects*, 23rd November.

578 Holt, A. (2010). Disciplining 'problem parents' in the youth court: Between regulation and
 579 resistance. *Social Policy and Society*, 9, 89-99.

580 Howes, C. (1999). Attachment relationships in the context of multiple caregivers. In J.
 581 Cassidy and P. R. Shaver, (Eds.), *Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research, and Clinical*
 582 *Applications* (pp. 671-687). New York: Guilford.

583 Howes, C., Rodning, C., Galluzzo, D. C., and Myers, L. (1988). Attachment and childcare:
 584 Relationships with mother and caregiver. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 3, 703-715.

585 Labov, W. (1972). The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. In W. Labov (Ed.),
 586 *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular* (pp. 354-396).
 587 Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

588 Labov, W., and Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience.
 589 In: J. Helm (Ed.), *Essays on the verbal and visual arts*, pp. 12-44. Seattle: University of
 590 Washington Press.

591 Lavis, V. (2010). Multiple researcher identities: Highlighting tensions and implications for
 592 ethical practice in qualitative interviewing. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 7, 316-331.

593 McCarver, V. (2011). The rhetoric of choice and 21st-Century feminism: Online
 594 conversations about work, family, and Sarah Palin. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 34,
 595 20-41.

596 Mullings, B. (1999). Insider or outsider, both or neither: Some dilemmas of interviewing in a
 597 cross-cultural setting. *Geoforum*, 30, 337-350.

598 O'Grady, K. (2005). Professor Ninian Smart, phenomenology and religious education. *British*
 599 *Journal of Religious Education*, 27, 227-237.

600 Okin, S. M. (1996). Sexual orientation, gender, and families: Dichotomizing differences.
 601 *Hypatia*, 11, 30-48.

602 Parpart, J. L., and Thompson, L. (2011). Engendering (In) security and conflict in African
 603 international relations. In S. Cornelissen, F. Cheru, and T. M. Shaw (Eds.), *Africa and*
 604 *International Relations in the 21st Century* (pp. 177-193). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

605 Phoenix, A., Woollett, A. and Lloyd, E. (1991). *Motherhood: Meanings, Practices and*
 606 *Ideologies*. London: Sage Publications.

607 Raddon, A. (2002) Mothers in the academy. *Studies in Higher Education*, 27, 387–403.

608 Riessman, C. K. (1987). When gender is not enough: Women interviewing women. *Gender*
 609 *and Society*, 1, 172-207.

610 Riessman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative Analysis: Qualitative Research Methods Series 30*.
 611 California: Sage Publications.

612 Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences*. London: Sage
 613 Publications.

614 Riley, T., and Hawe, P. (2005). Researching practice: The methodological case for narrative
 615 inquiry. *Health Education Research*, 20, 226-236.

616 Rodriguez, D. (2014). Marge Vicedo, The nature and nurture of love: From imprinting to
 617 attachment in cold war America. *Feminism and Psychology*. Advance online publication doi:
 618 10.1177/0959353514558763.

619 Ryan-Flood, R., and Gill, R. (2010). *Secrecy and silence in the research process: Feminist*
 620 *reflections*. London: Routledge.

- 621 Sarbin, T. R. (1986). *Narrative psychology: The storied nature of human conduct*. Praeger
622 Publishers/Greenwood Publishing Group.
- 623 Squire, C. (2005). Reading narratives. *Group Analysis*, 38, 91-107.
- 624 Vaughn, B., Deane, K. E., and Waters, E. (1985). The impact of out-of-home care on child-
625 mother attachment quality: Another look at some enduring questions. In I. Bretherton and E.
626 Waters (Eds.), *Growing points in attachment theory and research. Monographs of the Society*
627 *for Research in Child Development* (pp. 110-135). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 628 Vicedo, M. (2013). *The nature and nurture of love: From imprinting to attachment in Cold*
629 *War America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.